

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 12

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1925

WHOLE NO. 489

## GENERAL INDEX

TO

## THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY,

Volumes I-XVI

and

### Index to Volume XVII

Bound together in cloth

112 pages

\$1.25<sup>1</sup>

Send orders, with remittance, to

CHARLES KNAPP,

1737 Sedgwick Ave.

New York City

<sup>1</sup>This price is open only to those who have subscribed one dollar or more to the cost of the Index I-XVI. To others the price is \$2.25.

## Lewis's Elementary Latin Dictionary

NEW EDITION. By CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D. With an Appendix of Persons and Places, compiled by Hugh MacMaster Kingery, Ph.D., Professor of Latin, Wabash College. 1033 pages. **\$3.00.**

This dictionary has long been recognized as the standard authority. In the new edition its usefulness has been considerably increased by the addition of an Appendix of seventy-seven pages containing the names of persons and places met in the Latin authors commonly studied in the first two years of the College course.

In prose the following are covered in the Appendix: The *De Senectute*, the *De Amicitia* and selections from the *Letters* of Cicero; Books I, XXI, XXII of Livy entire, with the portions of other books contained in Burton's Selections; selections from the *Letters* of Pliny; and the *Annals*, *Histories*, *Agricola*, and *Germania* of Tacitus. In verse the following works are included: all of Catullus, Horace, and Terence; the eight plays of Plautus most generally read; and all the selections in Harrington's edition of the Roman elegiac poets.

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

## 1925 is here

and the 1925 College Entrance Examinations will be here surprisingly soon—all too soon for the student who is not already being adequately prepared for them.

## VIRGIL'S AENEID AND OVID'S METAMORPHOSES

*By Greenough, Kittredge and Jenkins*

Makes the best preparation possible for your pupils. It exactly meets the 1925 College Entrance Requirements in Virgil and Ovid, as well as every need of the High School Latin course. It contains, in one volume, the first six books of the Aeneid, selections from the remaining books to complete the story of Aeneas (about 800 lines), and a summary of the omitted portions, together with the selections from Ovid's Metamorphoses recommended for College reading.

Scholarly notes and introductions simplify the work of the teacher.

70 Fifth Avenue

*Ginn and Company*

New York

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 12

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1925

WHOLE NO. 489

## TWO CLASSICAL INSCRIPTIONS ON AMERICAN PUBLIC BUILDINGS

In October, 1923, a lady, who had been a student of mine at Barnard College, but was then Secretary to the Editor of one of the great New York dailies, wrote to me as follows:

I am trying to run down the source of the inscription that appears on the front of the New York Post Office building at Eighth Avenue and 33rd Street—"Neither snow nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds"—and wonder if you will be good enough to help me. I find it stated in one place that it is from Herodotus. Could you, without too much trouble, give me the exact reference?

In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.71 there was a very brief reference, unsigned, to this inscription, based on a Washington dispatch, printed in *The New York Times* of October 27, 1912, to the effect that "The Treasury Department has selected a quotation from Herodotus, to be carved on the Eighth Avenue façade of the new Post Office building in New York. . ." The further statement was made that the original of the inscription is to be found in Herodotus 8.98.

My reply to my correspondent ran as follows:

Herodotus (8.97) says that Xerxes, after his defeat at Salamis, tried to trick the Greeks and the Persians both, by works which, on their face, implied that he was planning to stay in Greece, to fight the war out. What follows at the end of Chapter 97, and in Chapter 98, runs thus in the translation by George Rawlinson <this was the only translation readily available at the time of this correspondence>:

"Mardonius, however, was in no respect deceived; for long acquaintance enabled him to read all the king's thoughts. Meanwhile Xerxes, though engaged in this way, sent off a messenger to carry intelligence of his misfortune to Persia.

Nothing travels so fast as these Persian messengers. The entire plan is a Persian invention, and this is the method of it. Along the whole line of road there are men (they say) stationed with horses, in number equal to the number of days which the journey takes, allowing a man and a horse to each day; and these men will not be hindered from accomplishing at their best speed the distance which they have to go, either by snow, or rain, or heat, or by the darkness of night. The first rider delivers his despatch to the second, and the second passes it to the third; and so it is borne from hand to hand along the whole line, like the light in the torch-race, which the Greeks celebrate to Vulcan. The Persians give the riding post in this manner, the name of 'Angarum'".

See the article *Angaria* in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

In May, 1924, a newspaper man, whose acquaintance I had made in Syracuse, New York, but who was stationed then in Washington, D. C., wrote me as follows:

Across the front of the new building of the National Academy of Sciences in this city is a Greek inscription, said to be a quotation from Aristotle. What it is all about is, at any rate, a mystery, for, so far as I have been able to discover, not one of the intellectual prodigies who inhabit the building is able to read, much less to translate it.

So I copied it as well as a poor journalist innocent of Greek might, and bethought me to send it to you for translation. As a worker in the building myself, Science Service having offices there, I'm naturally curious, especially as rumor has it that the inscription might be construed as an ironical commentary on some of the pretensions of science, and that, for this reason, knowledge of its meaning is kept guarded. Needless to say, I shall not disclose the source of my information.

I found my correspondent's version of the inscription not altogether clear, since, in his innocence of Greek, he had made some serious errors of transcription. The inscription comes from Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book 1 (in the shorter version, 993 A-B). It is a slightly condensed version of Aristotle's words, according to the Teubner Text (the inscription, of course, is given all in capital letters):

'Η περὶ τῆς δληθελας θεωρία τῇ μὲν χαλεπῇ, τῷ δὲ 'ραδίᾳ. Σημεῖον δὲ τὸ μήτ' ἀξίως μηδένα δύνασθαι τυχεῖν αὐτῷ, μήτε πάντως ἀποτιγχάνειν, ἀλλὰ ἐκατον λέγειν τι περὶ τῇ φύσεω, καὶ καθ' ἓν μὲν ή μηδὲν ή μικρὸν ἐπιβάλλειν αὐτῷ, ἐκ πάντων δὲ συναθροιζόμενων γίγνεσθαι τι μέγεθος.

I made out for my correspondent the following 'expanded translation', as Professor Lane Cooper would call it:

'The search for the truth is in part difficult, in part easy. An indication of this dual character of the search lies in the fact that no one has power to reach, in truly worthwhile fashion, the truth <completely>, yet no one misses it altogether. Each man says something about nature <nature> here equals, I take it, Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura*, and one by one they contribute <to the truth> either nothing at all, or else just a little, and yet, out of the sum total of all these things gathered together, a great structure is being wrought'.

There came into my hands very recently a copy of a monumental edition of Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, by W. D. Ross, Fellow of Oriel College, Deputy Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford, and General Editor of the Oxford Translation of Aristotle (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.207, 17.112). In two places Professor Ross gives a reading different from that accepted for the inscription on the Science Building. He reads θγεῖν, not τυχεῖν, and πάντας, not πάντως. In both places his preference is amply justified by the manuscript evidence. The second reading preferred by him is certainly far better, in itself, than the reading accepted for the inscription, because the antithesis between 'no one' and 'every one', especially when supplied

by the manuscripts themselves, is far better than an antithesis between a pronoun 'no one' and an adverb, which is (a) due to conjecture by a modern scholar, (b) must have a sense different from that in which Aristotle regularly uses it (see below).

The sense will now be, 'And an indication of this lies in the fact that no one hits it in truly worthy fashion, and yet <the seekers after it> do not all miss it'.

In his brief analysis of this passage Professor Ross writes as follows:

The study of the truth is difficult in that no one can hit with precision the part he wants to hit, easy in that the target is too big to be entirely missed. The small results attained by each thinker make together a considerable total.

I venture the observation that this analysis is right only on the basis of the reading *τίττεται*, misinterpreted, too (I trust the oxymoric character of the foregoing sentence will be forgiven). In his commentary Professor Ross objects to *τίττεται*, on the grounds (a) that it is a conjecture, (b) that the sense it regularly has in Aristotle, 'in all circumstances', 'in any and every case', is not the sense the word must bear in our passage, if read there. At any rate, he had done better to bring out, in his analysis, the antithesis between 'no one' and 'every one' on whose effectiveness he insists in his notes, with the manuscript evidence in his support.

CHARLES KNAPP

#### PRAYER IN THE ILIAD AND THE ODYSSEY

(Concluded from page 87)

##### II

After it has been decided on high Olympus that Odysseus's sojourn away from his home is to come to an end, Athene, in the guise of Mentes, King of the Taphians, comes to Telemachus at Ithaca, and counsels him to go in quest of information concerning his father. She advises him to go first to Pylos and there question Nestor. He is to proceed thence to Sparta, and to ask Menelaus if he perchance know anything concerning the fate of the son of Laertes. The following day Telemachus calls an assembly of the Ithacans and asks for a ship and for men to go with him on the journey. He is rebuffed by the suitors. After the meeting has been dissolved, he prays to the goddess who had visited him the previous day (2.262-266):

Hear me, thou who yesterday didst come in thy godhead to our house, and badest me go in a ship across the misty seas, to seek tidings of the return of my father that is long gone: but all this my purpose do the Achaeans delay, and mainly the wooers in the naughtiness of their pride.

Thereupon Athene in the guise of Mentor gets together a crew and secretly they go off to Pylos. When they arrive at their destination, the entire family of Nestor and the people of Pylos are engaged in a solemn sacrifice and libation in honor of Poseidon. Peisistratus, the son of Nestor, bids the new-comers pray to Poseidon, of whose feast they have been partakers, and Athene prays thus (3.55-61):

Hear me, Poseidon, girdler of the earth, and grudge not the fulfilment of this labour in answer to our prayer. To Nestor first and to his sons vouchsafe renown, and thereafter grant to all the people of Pylos a gracious recompense for this splendid hecatomb. Grant moreover that Telemachus and I may return when we have accomplished that for which we came hither with our swift black ship.

Telemachus prays in the same manner.

When later the goddess vanishes in the form of a sea-eagle, Nestor congratulates Telemachus on this protection from heaven and thus addresses the goddess (3.380-384):

Nay be gracious, queen, and vouchsafe a goodly fame to me, even to me and to my sons and to my wife revered. And I in turn will sacrifice to thee a yearling heifer, broad of brow, unbroken, which man never yet hath led beneath the yoke. Such an one will I offer to thee, and gild her horns with gold.

This promise is faithfully carried out the following day with an elaborate ceremonial which the poet describes at considerable length.

The suitors in Ithaca learn in the meantime of Telemachus's departure, and plan to kill him secretly on his return. When Penelope hears of this, she is broken-hearted, and at the advice of Eurykleia turns in her anguish to Athene (4.762-765):

Hear me, child of Zeus, lord of the aegis, unwearied maiden! If ever wise Odysseus in his halls burnt for thee fat slices of the thighs of heifer or of sheep, these things, I pray thee, now remember, and save my dear son, and ward from him the wooers in the naughtiness of their pride.

Odysseus is now, though none of his family and none of the suitors is aware of the fact, definitely bound for home. By a special command from Olympus, Calypso has finally allowed him to take his departure. On the eighteenth day of his sailing, when he is within sight of the land of the Phaeacians, Poseidon, who is returning from the Aethiopians, sees Odysseus on his raft. Remembering the prayer of Polyphemus, he arouses a great storm which completely shatters the craft. By the kind intervention of the nymph Leucothea, who gives him her wimple for a life-buoy, Odysseus is kept afloat for two nights and two days. On the third day the storm comes to an end, but the coast is too dangerous for a landing. Finally he comes to the mouth of a river which he supplicates in the following terms (5.445-450):

Hear me, O king, whosoever thou art; unto thee am I come, as to one to whom prayer is made, while I flee the rebukes of Poseidon from the deep. Yea, reverend even to the deathless gods is that man who comes as a wanderer, even as I now have come to thy stream and to thy knees after much travail. Nay pity me, O king; for I avow myself thy suppliant.

The god checks the vehemence of the stream, thus making it possible for Odysseus finally to reach dry land. The next day he meets Nausicaa, who listens graciously to his entreaties and supplies his wants. Acting on her advice, Odysseus does not go with her into the city of the Phaeacians, but stays awhile in the grove of Athena outside the town. Here he calls upon his patron goddess (6.324-327):

Listen to me, child of Zeus, lord of the aegis, unwearyed maiden; hear me even now, since before thou hearest not when I was smitten on the sea, when the renowned Earth-shaker smote me. Grant me to come to the Phaeacians as one dear, and worthy of pity.

This prayer the poet is careful to tell us the goddess heard and answered.

In the course of the entertainment that is proffered him at the court of Alcinous, Odysseus is finally brought to tell his name and his story. One noble episode after another is narrated in what is perhaps the greatest romance of all literature. The Cicones, the Lotophagi, Polyphemus, Aeolus, Circe are names which have stamped themselves indelibly on the imagination of the Western world. But only one of these characters serves our immediate purpose. After Polyphemus has been worsted by Odysseus, and finds no means of avenging himself, he calls upon his father Poseidon (9.528-535):

Hear me, Poseidon, girdler of the earth, god of the dark hair, if indeed I be thine, and thou avowest thee my sire,—grant that he may never come to his home, even Odysseus, waster of cities, the son of Laertes, whose dwelling is in Ithaca; yet if he is ordained to see his friends and come unto his well-builted house, and his own country, late may he come in evil case, with the loss of all his company, in the ship of strangers, and find sorrows in his house.

After Odysseus has finished the tale of his adventures, Alcinous orders that all present bestow gifts upon the guest before his departure. The following day is devoted to feasting. After sunset the boat which is to take Odysseus back to Ithaca puts out of the harbor. When the ship has reached its destination, Odysseus, who is sound asleep, is laid upon the shore by the Phaeacian mariners. Upon waking he does not recognize his native land because of a mist which Pallas Athene has scattered about him. When the mist has been raised, after the goddess herself has given him instructions, he prays to the nymphs (13.356-360):

Ye Naiad nymphs, daughters of Zeus, never did I think to look on you again, but now be ye greeted in my loving prayers: yea and gifts as aforesome I will give, if the daughter of Zeus, driver of the spoil, suffer me of her grace myself to live, and bring my dear son to manhood.

At the advice of the goddess he goes to the swineherd, Eumaeus, whose kindly welcome he receives with a prayer to Zeus (14.53-54): "May Zeus, O stranger, and all the other deathless gods grant thee thy dearest wish, since thou hast received me heartily!"

Pallas Athene now hastens to Sparta to summon Telemachus from the court of Menelaus and Helen. She warns him of the snare which the suitors have laid for him and gives directions how to avoid it. Accordingly, when his ship reaches Ithaca, he disembarks at a place from which he may proceed on foot to visit Eumaeus. While the swineherd is absent—for Telemachus has dispatched him to inform Penelope of his return—the disguise of Odysseus, the work of Athene, is removed by the same divine agency. Telemachus at first believes that a god is mocking him, but is finally persuaded that he is really standing in the presence of his father. Together they consult on the vengeance to

be inflicted upon the suitors. The next morning Telemachus goes to the palace and later in the day Eumaeus escorts Odysseus, whom Athene restored to his original guise before Eumaeus's return, to the same place. On the way they meet Melanthius, the goatherd, who severely taunts and maltreats Odysseus. Eumaeus rebukes him, and prays to the nymphs (17.240-246):

Nymphs of the well-water, daughters of Zeus, if ever Odysseus burned on your altars pieces of the thighs of rams or kids, in their covering of rich fat, fulfil for me this wish:—oh that he, even he, may come home, and that some god may bring him! Then would he scatter all thy bravery, which now thou flauntest insolently, wandering ever about the city, while evil shepherds destroy the flock.

When they arrive at court, Telemachus sends bread and meat to Odysseus and the latter requites his kindness with a brief invocation similar to those he has pronounced at the hut of Eumaeus (17.354-355): "King Zeus, grant me that Telemachus may be happy among men, and may he have all his heart's desire!" The suitors quite naturally express their contempt of Telemachus for his action. Later, Odysseus begs a dole of Antinoos, who hurls his stool at him, but their estimate of the stranger rises at least for a time after he has struck down the beggar Irus. There is irony in their complimentary words which take the form of a prayer (18.112-116):

May Zeus, stranger, and all the deathless gods give thee thy dearest wish, even all thy heart's desire, seeing that thou hast made that insatiate one to cease from his begging in the land! Soon will we take him over to the mainland, to Echetus the king, the maimer of all mankind.

Later that same day Odysseus and Penelope have a lengthy conversation in which the former is most careful to keep his identity concealed. While she is washing his feet, the nurse, Eurykleia, recognizes her master. By a threat of physical violence he keeps her from revealing who he really is. Penelope wakes in the course of the night and bemoans her fate (20.61-65, 79-83):

Artemis, lady and goddess, daughter of Zeus, would that even now thou wouldest plant thy shaft within my breast and take my life away, even in this hour! Or else, would that the stormwind might snatch me up, and bear me hence down the dusky ways, and cast me forth where the back-flowing Oceanus mingles with the sea. . . . Would that in such wise they that hold the mansions of Olympus would take me from the sight of men, or that fair-tressed Artemis would strike me, that so with a vision of Odysseus before mine eyes I might even pass beneath the dreadful earth, nor ever make a baser man's delight!

At dawn Odysseus, who has heard the weeping of Penelope, raises his hands and calls upon Zeus (20.98-101):

Father Zeus, if ye gods of your good will have led me over wet and dry, to mine own country, after ye had plagued me sore, let some one I pray of the folk that are waking show me a word of good omen within, and without let some sign also be revealed to me from Zeus.

His prayer is granted by a sudden clap of thunder from a clear sky. A woman grinding at the mill indoors hears the clap and prays (20.112-119):

Father Zeus, who rulest over gods and men, loudly hast thou thundered from the starry sky, yet nowhere is there a cloud to be seen: this surely is a portent thou art showing to some mortal. Fulfil now, I pray thee, even to miserable me, the word that I shall speak. May the wooers, on this day, for the last and latest time make their sweet feasting in the halls of Odysseus! They that have loosened my knees with cruel toil to grind their barley meal, may they now sup their last!

Odysseus hears her voice and rejoices over the complete answer to his prayer.

The rest of the *Odyssey* is devoted to the story of the slaying of the suitors and the recognition by Penelope. The action is swift and unimpeded. As in those books of the *Iliad* where the conflict is fiercest, so here there is no time to pray. Before the great climax is reached, however, the neatherd Philoetius and the swineherd Eumeus both express their desire that the lord of the house may return after his prolonged absence. When Odysseus assures the former with an oath that his return is not far off, the neatherd replies (20.236-237): "Ah, would, stranger, that Cronion may accomplish this word! So shouldst thou know what my might is, and how my hands follow to obey". Eumeus joins him in this wish by praying to all the gods for the return of his master. During the contest with the bow, just before he himself takes part, Odysseus reveals himself to his two loyal servants. First he asks them what their attitude would be, if their master should suddenly and unexpectedly return. Again their assurances and wishes take the form of prayer (21.200-201): "Father Zeus, if but thou wouldst fulfil this wish—oh, that that man might come, and some god lead him hither!"

When we compare the prayers of the *Odyssey* with those of the *Iliad*, certain differences become quite obvious. It is inevitable that the difference in local color and still more the difference in the tone and the spirit of the two poems should leave their mark on the prayers of the *Odyssey* also. The *Odyssey* is a tale of sea-faring, a story of wandering in the pursuit of a great desire. As we read it, we find ourselves in a different world from that of the *Iliad*. Here certain cults exist of which there is no mention in the story of the *Iliad*. Chief among these—certainly by far the most striking—is the cult of the nymphs at Ithaca. The cave which is sacred to them is one of the landmarks which Athene points out to Odysseus after she has removed the mist from his eyes. Besides the two prayers addressed to them there is the sacrifice of a portion of meat specially set aside for them at the beginning of a meal (14.435).

A cult which is much more strongly represented in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad* is that of Poseidon. Although this god plays a very important rôle in the *Iliad*, there is only the slightest trace in the *Iliad* of anything that might be called a cult of Poseidon, but in the *Odyssey* we find such a cult in full vigor. This is due, in large part, to the fact that the epic is one of sea-travel. When Telemachus arrives at Pylos, the people with their king Nestor and his entire family are engaged on the shore in a solemn sacrifice and feast

in honor of the sea-god. The Phaeacians also, as a sea-going folk, pay homage to Poseidon. The prayer of Polyphemus, on the other hand, is based on the Cyclops's purely personal relationship to the lord of the sea. This is one of those prayers which form a powerful motive-force in the plot.

Two prayers still remain for which we find no parallel in the *Iliad*. The first of these is that of Odysseus to the river of Phaeacia that he may be permitted to land. To be sure, the godhead of the two rivers, Simois and Scamander, figures rather prominently in the *Iliad*, but neither of them is ever addressed in prayer\*. The second prayer to which there is no exact parallel is Penelope's invocation of Artemis as goddess of destruction, unless one wishes to argue that Chryses's prayer to Apollo is a parallel, inasmuch as it involves the same conception with reference to the brother of Artemis. In the *Iliad*, on the other hand, we find one cult which is not duplicated in the *Odyssey*. Achilles's prayer to the winds is a unique invocation; still more striking perhaps is the way in which it is brought to the attention of the powers invoked. But different from all other prayers in the two poems is Thetis's prayer to Zeus that her son Achilles be avenged. It is the only prayer in either of the two epics addressed by one deity to another.

As for the points of resemblance in the prayers of the two poems, perhaps the most striking thing is the *quid pro quo* attitude on the part of the suppliant. This we get in the very first prayer of the *Iliad*—that of Chryses to Apollo. It is a motive which occurs again and again, usually in the form of a reminder to the god of the suppliant's past services to him. Such a reminder also Thetis uses when she begs the help of Zeus for the Trojans that her son may be avenged for the slight which Agamemnon has put upon him. In both poems Odysseus addresses himself primarily to Athene, his patroness. This does not hold, of course, for the courtesies of hospitality over which Zeus presides; nor does Odysseus call upon Athene for an important omen when he wishes one. Here he does what Priam did in the *Iliad* before he set out to ransom the body of Hector—he appeals directly to Zeus for a sign. Apollo also appears in the *Odyssey* in a rôle assigned to him at the beginning of the *Iliad*, that of a god of destruction. When Melanthius, the disloyal goatherd, hopes for the death of Telemachus, Apollo is in his mind the god who can accomplish such a desire (17.251-253).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

EUGENE J. STRITTMATTER

## REVIEWS

New Testament Greek for Beginners. By J. Gresham Machen. New York: The Macmillan Company (1923). Pp. xii + 285.

The contents of Mr. Machen's New Testament Greek for Beginners are as follows: an interesting Introduction (1-6), which gives a brief treatment of the

\*Nevertheless one interesting phase of the cult of rivers is found in the *Iliad*, 23.144 ff.

history of the Greek language and the place of New Testament Greek in that history; the elements of the language in thirty-three Lessons (9-221); Paradigms (225-251); Vocabularies (Greek-English, 255-268, English-Greek, 269-276); and an Index (279-285). The explanations are simple, clear, and adequate; the material is carefully graded; and the result is a thoroughly sound introduction to New Testament Greek, particularly useful now that Greek is less frequently studied in College than formerly.

The only important adverse criticism that occurs to the reviewer has reference to the kind of student for whom the book is designed. The lessons are of somewhat uneven length, but all are very long, compared with those of other beginners' books. For example, Lesson XXX contains the following material (pages 192-199, §§ 455-480): (1) A vocabulary of 22 Greek words; (2) The comparison of adjectives; (3) The declension of *μετών*; (4) The genitive of comparison, and comparison with *τι*; (5) The formation of adverbs and their comparison; (6) The genitive with adverbs of place; (7) The genitive of time within which; (8) The genitive of the articular infinitive expressing purpose; (9) The dative of respect; (10) The accusative of specification; (11) The dative of time; (12) The use and position of possessive adjectives; (13) The use of *μή* after words denoting fear, and in negative clauses of purpose; (14) Various uses of *τι* with the subjunctive; (15) The use of *μή* and *οὐ* in questions; (16) Greek and English exercises for translation. Surely no teacher would ever think of assigning all of this "Lesson" at once. But at any rate the great length of the Lessons would seem to make it clear that the book is designed for mature students, as one would have expected. On the other hand, at certain points the explanation seems to be intended for the very young or the very ignorant. A student who needs to be told (§ 99, page 50) that "In the sentence, *the apostle says the word*, it is asserted that the apostle does something to the word; *the word* is therefore the object of the action denoted by the verb", surely has no place in a theological seminary; but if in fact he be found there, he will need to study every one of Professor Machen's "Lessons" on the installment plan. They can, of course, easily be divided by the teacher; but, if this is found necessary, it means that Greek is not being read frequently enough or in large enough amounts in connection with the grammar work. The exercises are fairly long, but could be lengthened considerably with profit, it seems. Also, some simple selections from such writings as The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with fairly copious annotation, could to advantage have been added at the end of the book. Another addition which might be very useful to those who have done some work in classical Greek is a brief summary of the differences in usage between classical Attic prose and New Testament Greek.

The following criticisms refer to minor details.

(1) The statement in regard to the recessive accent of verbs (§ 13) is made without a hint that the student

will find exceptions later; in fact, the opposite impression is given.

(2) The introduction of the original primary endings of the verb in Lesson III (§ 20) is unnecessary, and at such an early stage is likely to prove confusing.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY CLINTON WALKER KEYES

Andivius Hedulio. Adventures of a Roman Nobleman in the Days of the Empire. By Edward Lucas White. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: T. Fisher Unwin (1921). Pp. vii + 613. 2 Maps. \$2.00<sup>1</sup>.

Many stories have been told, and many lays sung, of the great days of the Roman Empire, from Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar", and other plays, down to the nineteenth century. The twentieth century has now furnished its contribution to the picture of that great era of blood and conquest, of pomp and power, of display and degradation, in the form of one of the best novels of adventure I have read. Its author is Edward Lucas White, the American writer, who not so long ago published that fine novel "El Supremo", and is entitled "Andivius Hedulio". As a tale it is a series of never-failing excitements, but it is much more than a thrilling story—it is a literal reproduction of the most wonderful society that the ancient world ever saw, with all its splendours and miseries, its gods, its conquests, its party feuds, its nobles and its soldiers, bandits and gladiators, haughty aristocratic dames, and haughtier courtesans, and its Caesar, master of the world, who, at this particular time (A. D. 185), was Commodus, son of the wise Aurelius, the most matchless athlete of whom history holds any record. The Romans, and the grandeur that was Rome, are not left as the literary abstractions of the novelist, but are

<sup>1</sup>Dr. White's book, *Andivius Hedulio*, ought to have been reviewed long ago in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. I made two unsuccessful efforts to secure reviews of the book.

What is printed above by way of review of the book came into my hands only recently. The original appeared in a paper called The Natal Advertiser, published at Durban, South Africa. The date of publication was March 3, 1924. The initials signed to the review, "B. R.", are those of Mr. Barry Ronan, of Durban, Natal, South Africa. Mr. Ronan is a graduate of an English University, Oxford or Cambridge. He had a thorough classical education at a first class English Public School, and at the University. He has been reviewing novels and romances since 1895. He writes, therefore, not only from the point of view of a man who has had a classical training, though not a professional classicist, but also from the point of view of a trained reviewer, within whose special department Mr. White's book falls.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, by the way, has one subscriber in South Africa.

Mr. White took his Doctor's degree at The Johns Hopkins University. He has taught the classics for many years in Schools in Baltimore. In spite of long hours of teaching, and in spite of the additional handicap of ill-health, he has found time to write various novels. One of these, entitled *El Supremo*, and referred to by Mr. Ronan in his review, was highly praised, *homo consensu*, by the reviewers. Dr. McDaniel reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13. 95, and 12. 213-215 two books by Dr. White, which deal with classical things: *The Song of the Sirens and Other Stories*, and *The Unwilling Vestal, A Tale of Rome under the Caesars*. Some idea of Mr. White's way of preparing himself for the writing of these stories and novels dealing with classical themes can be got from his article, *The Vestal Virgins of Ancient Rome*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 12. 153-155. This article gives a list, well nigh exhaustive, of the passages in ancient classical authors which have to do with the Vestal Virgins: all of these Dr. White carefully studied and weighed in the course of preparation for the writing of his book, *The Unwilling Vestal*.

One thing, finally, might be added to Mr. Ronan's review. At the beginning of *Andivius Hedulio* there is a good-sized map of "The Roman Empire in the Second Century A. D., to Show the Wanderings of Andivius Hedulio". At the back there is a map, showing "The City of Rome Under the Empire".

C. K.

brought into the reader's consciousness exactly as if they were what he meets in his familiar daily life, and that is the test of any book really great.

The story is related by a young and wealthy nobleman, whose name forms the title of the book, who, by stress of adverse circumstances, is induced to leave his country estate for the fashionable things of Rome, and there unconsciously becomes entangled in a plot against the life of the Emperor. The only evidence was that of an Imperial secret service agent, who saw him conversing with a known leader of the conspiracy. Hedulio, with the assistance of his Greek slave, Agathermer, flies from Rome to evade arrest and execution. They disguise themselves as runaway slaves, branding each other, and suffering mutual flogging, to make their disguise more complete, and for nearly ten years they become homeless wanderers, occasionally having to return to Rome against their will, and during that time their adventures by land and sea were as numerous and as fascinating as those of the famous Three Musketeers, and they were difficult to beat at leading a varied and exciting life. Sometimes in silks, sometimes in tatters, now lording it in Roman villas, now in Roman dungeons, they had experiences which fill 600 pages with thrilling narrative that never once grows stale.

The central figure is Caesar. Commodus is drawn with great skill. Handsome, slight, but all tense muscle, his tendencies were all for the sports of the arena, the combats with wild beasts, and death struggles with the gladiators, so that the public murmured discreetly that the Prince of the Republic was neglecting his duties as ruler for the applause of the arena. But Commodus could govern with a steel hand when he felt inclined that way. For a long period all Rome was acclaiming the feats of Palus, the incomparable charioteer. Yet all that time the Imperial Pavilion in the Circus was occupied by a false Caesar, a substitute bearing a striking resemblance to the Emperor, while Commodus, under the name of Palus, drove his teams time after time to victory amid the plaudits of the multitude. Again, we see Commodus, clad in brilliant armour, receiving the mutinous cohorts who had made their way from Britain to warn the Emperor of the misdoings of Perennis, his Prefect of the Praetorium, to whom Caesar had relegated most of his duties. The soldiers accused Perennis not only of misappropriating the army funds, but of plotting to dethrone Caesar in order to put one of his sons in his place. Commodus, seated on the platform, surrounded by his gentlemen, including the accused and his family, heard both sides, but the defence of Perennis, naturally, was weak, and Caesar issued his fiat: "I turn him over to you". Perennis was hurled from the platform and torn to pieces by the angry soldiers. "The family of a traitor is abolished with him", said Caesar, and the two sons, wife, and sister of Perennis were hurled to the mob to share a similar fate. It is on record that Commodus killed 100 bears in the arena in a single day. He was strangled in his sleep in mistake for his substitute, a country gentleman, who was kept safely hidden in the palace. He was succeeded by Pertinax, who was mur-

dered by his own guards when he had been less than three months Emperor. And the following Emperor, Julianus, was also assassinated after a brief reign.

How Hedulio, after much suffering, was absolved and his estates restored, cannot be told here, for I should need many columns to dwell on the events so graphically described; plebeians, plutocrats and gentlemen of equestrian rank, all prototypes of present day people; the descriptions of gorgeous scenery, costumes and uniforms; the many types, particularly the feminine types; the gaols, the menageries, the bandits' retreats in the hills, and much more good reading, must be left to the reader to discover. There are two or three bad blemishes, such as a noble Roman using the mid-Victorian phrase "I twig", and others, using such pronounced Americanisms as "right here", "It is up to you", and "missing my guess". But despite these few faults the only opinion that can be expressed is that Mr. White has written a book in every way, in conception and craftsmanship, that is great.

B. R.

#### ROMAN BRITAIN

Map of Roman Britain. Published by the Ordnance Survey. Southampton (1924).

Roman Britain. By R. G. Collingwood. Oxford: at the University Press (1923). Pp. 104.

A constant and ever-increasing interest in antiquity is indicated by the notices that appear almost daily in the English papers, wherein Roman excavations in British soil share the headlines with the lost (and not yet found) books of Livy. Archaeology has become in recent years a popular staple of news. During the past summer a traveler in England could hardly take up a newspaper without reading of some new light thrown upon the period of Roman occupation. Excavation would seem to be a favorite outdoor sport, in which various parts of the country display an honest and stimulating rivalry. One day we read of further excavations of the extensive remains of Roman villas at Folkestone, where in August, 1923, the fort of the Classiarii Britannici (British Marines) was uncovered on the East Cliff. That most modern of seaside resorts is now a Mecca for archaeologists. Then comes the news from Yorkshire that two young students have laid bare a considerable part of Roman Isurium, the capital of the Brigantes, and the quiet village of Aldborough begins to rival the attractions of Harrogate. Further discoveries are reported at Rudchester in Northumberland, where Vindobala, one of the most important stations on the Roman Wall, overlooks the lovely valley of the Tyne. But the Roman Wall has been much in the public eye, because of the Queen's visit to Borcovicium, while the guest of the Duke of Northumberland. How characteristically English! Now we are glad to hear of a movement on foot to make it a national monument. The Times of August 12 had an admirable editorial on Roman Britain and a fascinating article on The Roman Wall.

The timely appearance of the new Ordnance Survey

Map of Roman Britain marks, perhaps, the apex of this new enthusiasm. It is at any rate a notable monument to it, and indispensable in any study of this now popular subject. Here one may see at a glance the amazing extent of Roman civilization in England, with its tentacles reaching also into Wales and Scotland. All Roman roads are carefully traced; *municipia* and *coloniae*, towns and other civil sites, legionary forts and other fortresses, permanent and temporary, even signal stations and potteries, all appear with clear distinguishing marks, and with the Latin names wherever these are known; and the map is furnished with an Index and with a brief prefatory outline of the subject.

Probably the best general account of Roman Britain, in brief and popular form, is to be found in a slim and attractive volume in the excellent Oxford series of The World's Manuals. This volume, entitled Roman Britain, is by R. G. Collingwood, a disciple of Haverfield. The book is well illustrated, and gives a readable history of the Conquest and Occupation (22-40), followed by accounts of Town and Country Life (41-68), Art and Language (69-88), and Religion (89-96). An Introduction (11-22) and a Conclusion (97-101) sum up the subject in modest but interesting fashion, and a brief Bibliography (102) completes the usefulness of this serviceable and scholarly manual. Not the least of its services is the correction of a general misunderstanding as to the extent and the permanence of the Romanization of the Britons, and a study of the new Ordnance Map should help to make such misconceptions hereafter impossible. In his Introduction Mr. Collingwood writes thus:

... Most English students of the subject have looked at it too much from the English point of view and too little from the Roman, and this habit has given currency to a picture of Roman Britain which is in many ways quite false. . . . The essence of the traditional view is the notion that between Britons and Romans there was an initial cleavage of race, language, and culture which to the last was never really bridged. . . . The 'Romans' were not a pure race but a very mixed one, and one of the chief elements in the mixture was just that Celtic strain which predominated in Britain. . . . To say that Britain became Romanized means that the Britons did not remain a mere subject race, held down by a Roman army. They became Romans; Romans in speech, in habits, and in sentiment. . . . Their patriotism, their loyalty, was directed to the Empire of which they were members; and a Briton of the third century could say with a glow of pride, like St. Paul, 'I am a Roman'. . . . The civilization vanished, but the race remained, and its character, I venture to think, has reasserted itself—mental and physical character alike.

HOBART COLLEGE

H. H. YEAMES

Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament.  
By William Hersey Davis. New York: George H. Doran Company (1923). Pp. x + 251.

The contents of Professor Davis's Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament are as follows: an Introduction, by the author's colleague and former teacher, Professor A. T. Robertson; a Preface; fifty-

nine Lessons on the Greek of the New Testament (Part I); a Supplement (Part II), containing paradigms, etc.; and an Index. Its purpose is thus stated by its author: "It is intended for those who are beginning the study of the Greek New Testament or have an imperfect knowledge of the essentials of the Greek of the New Testament, and to serve as a preparation for *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (A. T. Robertson)". Professor Robertson makes it clear in his Introduction (vii ff.) that the intention is to introduce the student to Greek in accordance with "the new science of language", and says: "The student who starts with Davis' *Beginner's Grammar* can go right on to my *Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* without a break or jolt. Then he will be ready for my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. It is only a step further to the Brugmann-Thumb *Griechische Grammatik*, and in the same direction".

In the reviewer's opinion, Professor Davis has written a good book, considered as an introduction to the Grammars mentioned, but one which will not be very useful for the ordinary purposes of a beginners' book. The exceptional student who possesses an excellent foundation in English and Latin grammar, and wishes to proceed to a scientific study of the grammar of the Greek New Testament can doubtless use it with profit. But the great majority, who desire chiefly to learn how to read the New Testament in Greek, will find many obstacles in their path, for which the author's enthusiasm for "the new science of language" appears to be chiefly responsible. A few of these difficulties are as follows.

- (1) The declensions are given with eight cases.
- (2) The statements about primitive verb-endings and their development (26, etc.), and about the significance of tenses, are, in their present form and at their present length, entirely unsuited to a beginners' book. In general, too much technical matter is introduced and too much technical language used. The ordinary beginner will only be confused and hindered by such terms as "durative", "punctiliar", "constative", "ingressive", and "Aktionsart", even if they are explained.
- (3) Different verbs are used in the different paradigms of conjugation given in the Lessons; this will confuse some students.
- (4) The exercises for translation are far too short. These exercises, by the way, are all (or nearly all) taken directly from the New Testament without change. This has certain obvious disadvantages for students who are familiar with the English version. Anyone, in fact, can 'find the places' without difficulty.
- (5) The supplement does not contain a complete collection of paradigms, and there are no general vocabularies in the book.

Many of the faults of the book will doubtless not be faults at all in Professor Davis's own use of it with his classes, but they will add enormously to the troubles of most students, particularly, of course, those who "wish to learn how to read the Greek New Testament with-

out the advantage of a teacher", to whom the volume is particularly recommended by Professor Robertson (vii).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CLINTON WALKER KEYES

**Cinna and His Times. A Critical and Interpretative Study of Roman History During the Period 87-84 B. C.** By Harold Bennett. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company (1923). Pp. v + 72.

In his study, *Cinna and his Times*, etc., which constituted the major portion of his doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, Professor Bennett has attempted to reinterpret the political career of L. Cornelius Cinna in the light of a fresh examination of the historical sources for this period. As a result he has been led to challenge in several important points the currently accepted views of Mommsen, *History of Rome*, and of the biography of Cinna by Drumann-Groebel.

The more significant of Professor Bennett's new conclusions are the following. Cinna was elected consul in 88 B. C. with Sulla's support, not in opposition to a Sullan candidate. Plutarch's words about this election (Sulla 10) admit of no other interpretation (5). Before entering upon his consulship, Cinna had not been in league with Marius, or in sympathy with the Italians (6); his alliance with Marius was made for political and military reasons after the return of Marius to Italy in 87 (12). The massacre of Marius's body-guard of slaves, which Mommsen placed after the death of Marius, took place at Cinna's orders while Marius was still alive (30). Marius was not responsible for all the executions of the year 87. They were the result of an organized campaign of murder for which all the leaders of the anti-senatorial party shared the responsibility. Furthermore, there was no promiscuous slaughter, and only a small proportion of the Senate perished (34). As these murders were purely political in character, there was no persecution of the rich for the sake of their wealth, and the *equites* consequently escaped molestation (34-35). The restoration of the juries to this latter class is to be placed late in 87 (36). The Lex Valeria De Aere Alienno Solvendo of 86 B. C. is justified as a necessary evil, and is held to be part of an honest attempt to deal with the disturbed economic situation. As such it is to be connected with the reforms of the currency attributed to M. Marius Gratidianus, whose praetorship is placed in this year (40-41). It is suggested that the traditional figures for the census of 86-85 B. C., namely CCCCLXIII *milia* (463,000) should be corrected to DCCCLXIII *milia* (863,000), instead of to DCCCC-LXIII *milia* (963,000), as Beloch has advocated (44). In the ill-fated expedition of Flaccus to the East, the armies of Flaccus and Sulla did not face each other at Meliteia (46), and the death of Flaccus himself occurred in December, 86, while he was still consul (50). Lucullus, the commander of Sulla's fleet, was justified in not cooperating with Fimbria in blockading Mithradates in Pitane (52). Cinna's terms to Mithradates,

offered through Fimbria, did not include the surrender of any Roman territory, and were easier than those presented by Sulla only in the matter of the indemnity (54). There was no renewal of proscriptions in Rome in the fall of 85, but rather a policy of conciliation was adopted towards men of influence (55-56). Plutarch's tale (Pompey 5) that the death of Cinna was due to a riot of his soldiers, who believed that he had killed the young Pompey, is held to be based on the fact that Pompey had invited Cinna's troops to mutiny against leaving Italy and so was remotely responsible for the latter's death (61). Cinna himself is characterized as an unprincipled opportunist, the first tyrant of Rome since the expulsion of the Tarquins (62). His aim was to set up a disguised autocracy, gained by the support of his troops and based upon the perpetual consulship and the support of the Italians. He succeeded to a point where his supporters were in control of the whole domain of Rome except the scene of the war with Mithradates (64-68). His permanent influence upon Roman political history lay in the example which he set of trying to cloak absolutism under constitutional forms (69).

Professor Bennett's views are well stated and are cogently, in many cases quite convincingly. His work is one of real scholarship to which all who seek to interpret the period with which it deals must give serious attention.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A. E. R. BOAK

#### CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

##### VI

Army Quarterly—April, Constantinople and its Cross-ways, Vaughan Cornish.

Art and Archaeology—October, Movie Realism and Archaeological Fact, Bruce Bryan [a very severe indictment of much advertised "movies" said by their producers to picture, realistically, ancient Egypt. At the close the author asks this question, "Why not secure the help of real Egyptologists for accuracy?"] I doubt not that a like indictment can be drawn against the current classical "movies." See my comments, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.79-80, 104, on a "movie" representing scenes from Aeneid 6, and Miss Hahn's comment, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.8, on the movie called Julius Caesar]; Review, brief, but favorable, by R. V. D. Magoffin, of E. Douglas Van Buren [Mrs. A. W. Van Buren], Archaic Fictile Revetments in Sicily and Magna Graecia.—December, Review, of indeterminate character, by Alfred Emerson, of Martin Schede, Die Burg von Athen [in two editions, German and English].

Cambridge Historical Journal—Volume I, No. 2, Some Aspects of Local Autonomy in the Roman Empire, J. S. Reid; The End of Roman Rule in North Gaul, J. B. Bury.

Catholic Historical Review—January, 1924, The Later Roman Empire, General Tasker H. Bliss.

CHARLES KNAPP